



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Book Reviews

**Old Testament and Semitic Studies.** In Memory of William Rainey Harper. Edited by ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, FRANCIS BROWN, GEORGE FOOT MOORE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908. Two vols. Pp. xxxiv+400 and 438. \$10.

Among the many memorials designed to continue and commemorate the work of President William Rainey Harper, none is more fitting than this monument of scholarship raised to his memory by students, his colleagues and his pupils, who have felt his influence and responded to his inspiration. These two notable volumes contain twenty-five Old Testament and Semitic studies, contributed by as many oriental scholars of this country, besides an introduction by Professor Francis Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, who, with Professor George Foot Moore, of Harvard University, and Professor Robert Francis Harper, of the University of Chicago, have edited this work. It is almost impossible to review such a book and quite impossible to do so in the space of a magazine article. Not a few of the studies contained in it deserve each a long and careful critique, if indeed they are to be reviewed at all. It goes without saying that the book as a whole is worthy of its purpose in scope, content, and execution, and reflects much credit on contributors and editors alike. Instead of attempting to review it, I shall merely note some additional facts regarding President Harper which may have interest in themselves, and which, as it seems to me, bear upon the relation of the contents of these volumes to his life.

Professor Brown's introduction is an appreciation of President Harper's work and personality. To one who was a fellow-student of President Harper at Yale, this chapter, valuable in itself, possesses a peculiar interest. It recalls memories of President Harper's youth, and of his extraordinary achievement and promise as a scholar at that period. He was only seventeen when he came to Yale, an uncouth boy, from three to five years the junior of us, his fellow-students in the newly created "post-graduate" department, not versed in the ways of the world and singularly lacking in knowledge of much that the student of a large university or the denizen of a great city acquires unconsciously. The first impression made on us, brought up in the atmosphere of an old university, was naturally unfavorable; but no long time had elapsed before he had won our respect and

admiration by proving competent not only to meet us, young as he was, on our own ground, but even to surpass us. His capacity for work was phenomenal, and he displayed a veritable greed for knowledge. Many years afterward, only a year before his own death, Professor Whitney, in talking over with me old times and former students, said that, with one exception, no student of all those whom he had taught had been able to keep pace with Harper.

To me Harper, as a fellow-student, was intensely interesting and stimulating, both from the keenness of his mind in class work and also from the instructive *naïveté* with which he looked out at the social and religious conditions about him, commenting on and criticizing what he saw in the most unconventional manner, from the outside, almost as though he were a denizen of another sphere, and yet with a shrewd insight into the meaning of things, which was both illuminating and disconcerting to the man to whom those things were a tradition. We studied together not only Sanskrit, under Professor Whitney, but also Hebrew, biblical Aramaic, and New Testament Syriac under Professor Day. Of the Semitic languages Yale offered at that time only Hebrew and biblical Aramaic, both in the Divinity School, and no other college or university in this country offered more or as much. We induced Professor Day to undertake with us an additional course in New Testament Syriac, and we also found a rabbi who was ready to teach us Talmudic and Rabbinical Hebrew, with whom we read a portion of Rashi and some Talmudic tractates. Semitic studies in this country were, as will be seen, very primitive and unscientific in those days. But not only could we not study the Semitic languages in general at any American institution, but there was absolutely no comparative Semitic study anywhere; in fact the science of comparative linguistics was at that time well worked out only in the Indo-European languages. Therefore we undertook to study Indo-European philology and Sanskrit under Professor Whitney at Yale for the sake of acquiring a scientific knowledge of the general principles of comparative philology, with a view to applying those principles later in the study of the Semitic languages, as opportunity might offer.

I spent three years in taking my degree of Ph.D., President Harper took his in two. For a while after he left Yale I lost sight of him. When I next heard of him he was applying the Sauveur method of teaching modern languages to Sanskrit in a summer school at Amherst. Harper's openness of mind and quickness of perception enabled him to obtain suggestions from all with whom he came in contact, which his fertile and resourceful brain developed into new and original combinations. From

Sauveur he seems to have derived the first suggestions of method of teaching; and partly from Sauveur's summer schools for language teaching, partly from the work of Maimon in Chicago, he drew his inspiration for popularizing Hebrew study. Maimon was a Croatian Jew, who had been Christianized and become a Baptist. Later he became an Anglican and the right hand of Helmuth, bishop of Huron, himself a Jew by origin. When Helmuth went to England as a suffragan bishop, Maimon went with him as his chaplain. Later he went to Baghdad as a missionary of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews. Then he became an antiquity speculator and sold antiquities, real and forged, in this country and Europe. At last accounts he was a Mohammedan in religion, the possessor of at least one Osmanli decoration, a concession broker and promoter by profession, with headquarters in Constantinople. During the Christian and Baptist portion of this unusually checkered religious and business career, Maimon, who was an extremely clever and a most plausible and engaging man, seeking means to earn his daily bread, began to give Hebrew lessons to a few ministers, and ultimately succeeded in arousing among the ministers of Chicago in general a considerable interest in Hebrew study. As Harper had caught from Sauveur the idea of teaching Hebrew in a modern way, as a real and living language, out of which he developed, piece by piece, his own remarkable system of teaching the language, opening the doors of that study to thousands of persons, men and women, who, without his method and the inspiration of his personality, would never have dreamed it possible to acquire any real knowledge of the Old Testament, much less of the language in which it was written, so the interest which Maimon had aroused among ministers suggested to him a fuller and more systematic development of the idea of teaching Hebrew outside the walls of the seminary among Christian ministers and the more thoughtful Christian laity, leading ultimately to the creation of his summer and correspondence schools, which spread an enthusiasm not only for the study of Hebrew and the Old Testament, but also for everything that bore upon the Bible, including the cognate Semitic languages, over a large part of the United States and Canada. No teacher in modern times, to the best of my knowledge, has accomplished such extraordinary results in arousing wide interest in a field commonly regarded as difficult and forbidding and in impressing his own personality as a teacher upon so many scholars.

With this larger work of Harper's I began to come in contact in 1882, when he commenced his first publication, *The Hebrew Student*. From that time on I was rather intimately associated with him as for a number of years a contributor to his publications, and a co-operator in his Hebrew Institute

and summer schools; and as I had formerly been impressed with his remarkable capacity for study, so I now came to know and wonder at his really marvelous capacity as a teacher and an organizer. In fact, as a teacher he was unsurpassed among all those with whom I have been associated in my career, and as teacher and organizer he did more to promote the study of the Bible than anyone of whom I can think, this side, certainly, of the extraordinary movements of the Reformation.

Some of us were trying in those days to secure the introduction into the colleges and universities of courses in Semitic languages, and thus to promote a more thorough and scientific study of the Bible in the theological seminaries. We advocated this through the public press and by a careful canvass of colleges and seminaries throughout the country, but all our labors would have gone for nothing if it had not been for President Harper. It was largely his summer schools and the interest which they elicited, first in Hebrew and then in the cognate Semitic languages, which brought about the very rapid introduction of Semitic courses into all the large universities and some of the larger and better-equipped seminaries of the country. President Harper himself was called to Yale and became the head of the Semitic department of that university. Here his wonderful teaching ability aroused a genuine enthusiasm for Old Testament study, and with an ever-broadening horizon he utilized his position to extend this interest to Semitic studies in general and to develop a thoroughly well-equipped Semitic department, offering instruction in all the Semitic languages. At this time, also, he began to realize the fact that archaeological research must go hand in hand with linguistic study for the interpretation of the records of the civilization of the past. Accordingly he took a sympathetic interest in the organization of the University of Pennsylvania Expedition to Babylonia, in recognition of which, at his request, his younger brother, Professor Robert Francis Harper, then a tutor at Yale, was appointed Assyriologist of that expedition. Over ten years later I again had the pleasure of becoming associated with President Harper, this time in the Ur Expedition, for the purpose of excavating the sites of ancient Babylonian cities. He was the president of that organization during the three years of its existence, and afterward, when the Ur Expedition had withdrawn from the field, on account of its failure to secure a firman from the Turkish government, he took over the firman, granted all too late to that organization, and sent out the University of Chicago expedition to Bismya, in connection with that great scheme of archaeological research which he had developed in the mean time as a part of the university's work.

Professor Brown, in his introductory chapter, has sketched President Harper's life and appraised his great work of education and organization. I have ventured to add certain personal experiences and recollections which may help to illustrate his picture of the man and his work. It is as an educator and an organizer of education that President Harper will be best known and remembered. His greatest achievements, even in the sphere of Bible study, were not his contributions to the interpretation of biblical passages or biblical books, or his expositions of the morphology or syntax of the Hebrew language, but the creation of a new zeal for that study and new methods in its prosecution.

This monument to his memory erected by Semitic scholars is primarily a monument to his achievements in the field of Bible study, but precisely for that reason it is eminently proper that it should include not only articles on Old Testament and Hebrews themes, but also papers covering the whole field of Semitic scholarship; for it was his conception that for a proper interpretation of the Old Testament it was necessary to cultivate the whole Semitic field. It may be added that it is at least doubtful whether we should have today in our universities and schools scholars who could treat the themes treated in this volume, had it not been for President Harper's practical leadership; and it is certain that such a book as this, covering the field which it does, could not have been published in this country at this time had it not been for President Harper's organizations and publications. Because of this these volumes constitute a singularly appropriate monument to his memory.

Now to turn to the contents of these volumes: the relative proportion which the different Semitic languages hold is curiously illustrative of the present condition of Semitic studies in this country and the present center of interest in those studies. Outside of Hebrew, the emphasis is laid on Assyrian-Babylonian—six papers, about one-quarter of the whole, dealing with topics included under the general category of Assyriology, the themes treated in these six papers being themselves illustrative of present developments in that field of study. Professor Prince presents a translation of an ancient hymn, written in the Sumerian tongue, the pre-Semitic language of the people whose script and civilization their Semitic conquerors adopted and adapted. Professor Barton deals with the origin of the Cuneiform signs, which came down to the Semites from their Sumerian predecessors. Here through Assyriology we are reaching out after the primitive sources on which the civilization and religion of Assyria and Babylonia were founded. Professor Jastrow's paper on "An Omen School Text," one of the most important, as an original contribution, in the whole volume, gives

a suggestion of what archaeological research is destined to do in illuminating the study of the development of religion. Dr. Ward's paper on cylinder and cone seals in the museum at St. Petersburg and Professor Price's article on Cassite seals look somewhat in the same direction, while Professor Johnson's treatise on the Assyrian word *nubattu* is more technically linguistic.

While the other cognate languages, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic, are all represented in this volume, they have together but four titles as over against the six assigned to Assyriology alone—namely, "The Original Language of the Parable of Enoch," by Professor Schmidt, Professor Clay's paper on Aramaic dockets on Babylonian tablets, which belongs on the border line between Assyriology and Aramaic study, Professor Gottheil's interesting account of Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt, and Professor McDonald's more technically Arabistic paper on a certain manuscript of "Abu-Hiffan's Collection of Anecdotes about Abu-Nuwâs."

The reawakened interest in text-study and the revolt against the old treatment of the Massoretic text as a finality shows itself in two forms in these volumes. We have, on the one side, from Professors Margolis, Paton, Torrey, and Haupt, highly technical studies of the Greek and other ancient versions of Habakkuk, of Esther, and of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, with elaborate critical apparatus. On the other side Professor Fagnani's article on "The Structure of the Text of the Book of Zephaniah" and, to some extent, Professor J. M. P. Smith's "Strophic Structure of the Book of Micah," aim to restore an original text by means of internal rather than external criticism, and especially by the study of poetic structure. The importance which this latter line of study—the study of poetic form and structure—has assumed in recent times, is shown by the further fact that, in addition to these two papers, Professor Briggs has contributed an "Analysis and Translation of Isaiah, chaps. 40-62," on the basis of his metrical theories, and Professor Arnold a discussion of "The Rhythms of the Ancient Hebrews," the one a concrete, the other an abstract treatment of the same general theme from very different standpoints. The older disciplines, syntax, biblical theology, word-studies, and critical comments, are all represented by papers which space will permit me to mention only by name: Professor Mitchell, on "The Omission of the Interrogative Particle," Professor Porter, on "The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings," Professor Davis, in a study of "Persian Words and the Date of Old Testament Documents," Professor Henry Preserved Smith, on "Theophorous Proper

Names in the Old Testament," Professor Toy, in notes on the Psalms, and Professor Bewer, in "Critical Notes on Old Testament Passages."

Compare these papers, both as to scope and contents, with the contributions in the *Hebrew Student* and the *Old Testament Student*, which represented the best available in this country twenty-five years ago, and the great development which has taken place in that period, in which President Harper himself played so pre-eminent a part, becomes strikingly or perhaps I might say better, glaringly apparent. All these papers, even that of Professor Davis, the most conservative contribution in these volumes, show not only the influence of modern critical methods, but also the broader sphere of vision of the modern scholar, and the increased mass of valuable material at his disposal. A study of them shows also very clearly that we are at the moment in a period of revision. The foundations of all things are being re-examined in the light of new material, which has been collected from manifold sources, and therefore these papers deal not directly with those themes which interested the scholars of a former generation, who regarded the traditional text as a finality and accepted as the basis of their own work the interpretations which had been handed down from the fathers of the past, nor even of that succeeding generation which was analyzing the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Testament and reforming Hebrew history. Here the point of view is still different. We are engaged in a much more radical and comprehensive study, which includes in its field of view not only the Old Testament, but also all the remains, literary, religious, and archaeological, of cognate and neighboring peoples, as well as the writings of mediaeval scholars, Jewish and Christian. This re-examination of that material, it may be added, not infrequently results in a reversal of what we had supposed to be almost the axioms of biblical scholarship. So Professor Moore contributes a characteristic paper from his browsings in quaint tomes and forgotten pamphlets on the use of the name Jehovah, showing that the universally accepted belief that this pronunciation was introduced at the Reformation, in 1520 A. D., is quite without foundation in fact, and he has indeed traced back the use of the word thus vocalized to 1278 A. D.

But these two volumes not only exhibit the present trend of Old Testament and Semitic study; they also suggest the vast new fields which have been and are still being opened to the student of the Old Testament, in regard to its text, its composition, its language and the relation of that language to other languages, the development of its religion and the relation of that religion to other religions, its archaeology, and the relation shown by the study of archaeology of the life of the Hebrews to the life of



other and older peoples. While the articles contained in these volumes indicate much achievement in the interpretation of the Old Testament and the knowledge of the old-world religions, of which the Old Testament was the flower, they reveal still more clearly the immense field for work and research which still lies before the Semitic student and specifically the student of the Old Testament.

One who knew him cannot but picture to himself the great interest with which President Harper would have perused these volumes; not only because of their tribute to him (with all his knowledge of his own power, he was a very modest man and singularly shy about appropriating praise; at the same time the appreciation of his friends and colleagues always touched and pleased him deeply), but also because of the field covered by them, and the great opportunities for further research and new developments of scholarship suggested in them. I can well imagine how, as he looked over paper after paper, he would have gained new suggestions of work to be done, difficulties to be conquered, fields of knowledge to be opened up; for it was impossible for President Harper to take up anything without finding, especially on the practical side, newer and larger aspects of the theme, of which even those most familiar with it had not dreamed; and in this lay much of the stimulation and the charm of association with him.

JOHN P. PETERS

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH  
NEW YORK

---

**Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.** By CARL CORNILL. Translated by G. H. Box. [Theological Translation Library, Vol. XXIII.] New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907. Pp. xii + 556. \$3.

Cornill's *Einleitung* holds a place among German books on Biblical Introduction corresponding to that held by Driver's *Introduction* among English works. It has run through five editions since its original appearance in 1891. The English translation is from the last edition. The treatment of the subject falls under two heads: first, Special Introduction, which forms the bulk of the book (462 pp.); second, General Introduction, including Canon and Text. A brief Appendix gives a chronological list of Old Testament literature, and the opening chapter of the book is devoted to the consideration of some important "Prolegomena." The author thus covers a wide range of territory within comparatively small space. When to this is added the fact that the type is large and clear, it will at once appear that the treatment is of necessity at times somewhat hurried and